FOUNDED 1921

MARCH 1972

EDITOR R.PALME DUTT

LABOUR MONTHLY

A MAGAZINE OF LEFT UNITY · 20p

The Editor
Economics of Bedlam

Richard Briginshaw
Unemployment

Christopher Norwood
Trade Unions and the Labour Party

Betty Sinclair
Ireland

John Gaetsewe and Alan Brooks
Southern Africa

Academician E. K. Fedorov
Environmental Problems

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY

Editor: R. Palme Dutt Associate Editor: R. Page Arnot

Managing Editor: Nicola Seyd

VOL. 54 No. 3 MARCH . 1972

CONTENTS

		Page
Notes of the Month: Economics of Bedlam. *Iron Laws of the Madhouse—Technical Advance: Increasing Contradictions—'Technological Unemployment'—Integration: Intensified Trade Wars—'European Unity': The Big Lie—Strategy of the Division of Europe—Napoleon's Warning—Why No Referendum?—Continuing Battle—Squandering the Surplus—Miners in the Vanguard*	**R.P.D.**	97
Unemployment	**Richard Briginshaw**	109
Unemployed. 1922		110
Trade Unions and the Labour Party: The Industrial Relations Act	**Christopher Norwood**	113
Honour to Emile Burns	**R.P.D.**	116
Can We Afford the Profit Motive?	**Harry Smith**	117
In Ireland—Then: *Will Hope* and *R. Page Arnot*		120, 121
Ireland	**Betty Sinclair**	122
Southern Africa		
South African Congress of Trade Unions	**John Gaetsewe**	127
The African People Say 'No!' ..	**Alan Brooks**	131
Fifty Years Ago		133
Environmental Problems	**Academician E. K. Fedorov**	134
That'll Teach 'Em!	**Roger Woddis**	138
Book Reviews: 'Law, Class and Society', Books Two and Three, D. N. Pritt: *W. Sedley*; 'The Unholy Hymnal', edited by Albert E. Kahn: *A.T.*; 'Mathematical Models of the Economy', Richard Stone, and 'Soviet Planning Today', Michael Ellman: *Phil Goodwin*; 'Marx and Keynes: The Limits of the Mixed Economy', Paul Mattick: *R. Bellamy*; 'Up With All That's Down!', Angela Tuckett: *Andrew Rothstein*		140
Alternative Press	**Nicola Seyd**	144
Publications Received		Inside back cover

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

ECONOMICS OF BEDLAM*

** These Notes were written before the main theme was confirmed and carried forward to a new stage by the Government's reckless offensive of destruction against the whole economy of the country in their desperate endeavour to defeat the solidarity of the miners and the working class. A last Note is added commenting on the significance of the miners' battle and the Government's action.*

> **'The Prime Minister predicted an end to stop-go economics and a prosperous Britain for all, if only British companies would seize the present opportunities and invest heavily in plant and machinery.'**
>
> Prime Minister HEATH, press conference on his return from signing away Britain's independence into the Common Market, *Times*, January 25, 1972.

February 11, 1972

If . . . if. . . . The old nugget of popular wisdom long ago remarked that 'If wishes were horses' a golden paradise could follow in which 'beggars would ride.' What stands in the way of Mr Heath's vision of 'a prosperous Britain for all'? The resources are there. Plant capable of production is lying idle. The workers capable of operating the plant are there, a million and a half of them unemployed. Capital in superabundance, as shown by the overwhelming excess response to the occasional market offer, is seeking investment. Why does not the Government use the superabundant capital available, set the idle plant in operation, modernise plant and give the unemployed work to produce the goods needed by all?

Iron Laws of the Madhouse

Why does Mr Heath set his vision of 'a prosperous Britain for all' in a hypothetical form dependent on an 'if'? 'If only British companies would.' Precisely. Because he knows very well that the real decision does not rest with the Government any more than with the people, but with the owners of capital, the giant monopolist 'British companies', whose finance and support have placed Mr Heath in office, and on whom he depends for his continuance in office. And he knows equally well that the giant monopolies of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British finance-capital are concerned with far more profitable areas of investment than to build the home productive economy of Britain, which they have allowed to decline in many respects into relative backwardness, consequent on the concentration of the majority of the top British monopolies on the profitable fields of overseas exploitation. 'On the day that it was announced that unemployment had reached a million the stock market rose above 500 for the first time in nearly three years' (*Guardian*, January 22). Such is the picture of the economy of Britain in 1972. A visitor from Mars (if that old exploded picture of a superior intelligence emanating from that planet may be permitted) could be excused for imagining that he was witnessing the economy of a madhouse.

Fifty Years On

Fifty years ago in these editorial Notes in the issue of March 1922, we wrote under the title: 'Can Capital Govern?' At that moment we chose this title because the current catch-word of all the oracles of official press wisdom was to pontificate on the profound and at that time still disturbing theme: 'Can Labour Govern?' There had not yet been a Labour Government in 1922, and they had not yet had the experience of six Labour Governments to prove that under reformist governments of this type the profitable flow of capitalist exploitation and extraction of surplus value could continue unimpeded and even enhanced. Accordingly under the polemical title 'Can Capital Govern?' to combat these lucubrations we wrote:

> Nine-tenths of the present talk about a 'trade depression', 'a slump', 'economic unsettlement', or 'inevitable after-war disturbances', is a fog of verbiage which hides the facts. It is the invocation of Mumbo Jumbo. There is no breakdown in the essential forces of production. The machinery is there; but it is left idle. The raw materials and food supplies are there; but they are burnt or left to rot. The workers are there; but they are left to tramp in unemployed processions. Only one thing stands in the way, and that is capitalist monopoly, which refuses to let the wheels of production go round: which refuses to produce the goods, because it cannot sell them at a profit, and cannot sell them at a profit because the distribution of wealth has become so top-heavy that the people who need the goods cannot buy them.

We pointed out that of the total capital investment of £405 million in 1921 'only about one-ninth was devoted to direct industrial production.'

> Houses are generally believed to be desperately needed in this country. Hospitals go begging in the streets. But the money, which tumbles over itself in its thirst for Anglo-Persian oil, is not available for these things.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> The workers who need them are too poor to furnish a sufficiently high rate of profit; they have no 'effective demand' (until such time as they may take it into their heads to show the startled economists a new form of 'effective demand').

And today? Despite all the enlargement in scale the same old story continues, more glaring than ever and with the contradictions multiplied. The madhouse is still in business.

Technical Advance—Increasing Contradictions

But has not capitalist production expanded on a gigantic scale during these fifty years? Is not this a proof of the success of this economic system? Such is the favourite contention of the apologists of capitalism today, who love to dwell on the miracles of automation and the scientific and technological revolution bringing into view the prospect of abundance and leisure for all. Certainly the science and technique of production has made unprecedented advance during these fifty years. Alongside, it may be noticed, a no less unprecedented advance of the science and technique of destruction, demonstrated in fascism, the world war and armaments dwarfing any previous level. Nor are the two aspects unconnected. In the capitalist world the record of these fifty years has demonstrated how the main dynamic factors driving forward the development of scientific research and technique have been the imperative requirement of war and armaments, with the most lavish resources and expenditure available for development in this sphere, alongside limitation of resources available for development in other constructive spheres.

'Technological Unemployment'

The widely discussed 'scientific and technological revolution' is still only in its earliest beginnings in the practice of current production. There is no question that its further advance brings into view the prospect of far-reaching social transformation to end the burden of old forms of labour and create the conditions for the fullest creative development of every human being. But these prospects can only be fulfilled in a society where the means of production are socially owned. In the existing capitalist society, with dominant monopoly capitalist ownership of the means of production alongside surviving pre-monopoly forms, the scientific and technological revolution, so far from bringing a solution to problems, creates new and more complex problems. The new contradictions arising on an enlarging scale with the development of the technological revolution

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are demonstrating the incompatibility of the new productive forces with the old monopolist private ownership forms. The new technological development, so far from releasing labour for new and more advanced skills, as in the Soviet Union, releases the workers from their old jobs only to fall into the morass of unemployment. So arises the characteristic modern problem of 'technological unemployment' in the current phase of the capitalist world. Thus in Britain in the third quarter of 1971, according to Mr Heath's report in parliament on January 24, 1972, productivity increased 6 per cent, output increased 1.6 per cent, but employment to produce this increased output fell by 4.9 per cent. In 1971 British manufacturing industry shed 454,400 jobs. In the United States this process has developed still further, and the official return of six million unemployed understates the real total. The desperate attempts at 'reflation' or deficit-financing to solve the problem have succeeded in stimulating inflation without so far perceptibly reducing unemployment. Hence the peculiar new phenomenon of the coincidence of high unemployment, usually a symptom of a business depression, with a simultaneous inflationary boom of high stock market prices and profits. 'The present high rate of unemployment,' Mr Heath admitted in the same speech on January 24, 'is characterised by a high rate of inflation, a combination which is unique in Britain's experience.' Thus the old contradictions have now been supplemented, not only despite, but in consequence of the new phase of advance of the technique and scale of capitalist production, by new and even more acute contradictions.

Integration—Intensified Trade Wars

The concentration and merging or alliance of the biggest capitalist monopolies across national frontiers, as in the West European Common Market and the Tory big business policy of tying Britain to this bloc, is presented as a triumph of 'unity' overcoming outdated national divisions and pointing towards the future of a harmonious integrated capitalism. On the contrary. In the economic sphere the mergers and combinations are the expression of intensified trade war between rival monopolist groupings seeking to build up stronger combinations for the battle. The open war during the second half of 1971 between the currencies of the wealthiest imperialist powers has only been patched up by the Washington Monetary Agreement of December 1971, which the West German Economics Minister Dr Schiller has described as 'a fragile cease-fire'. For political reasons the rulers of US imperialism initially favoured and helped to foster the formation of the Common Market

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bloc in Western Europe ('European Economic Community') as an economic counterpart of Nato, in order that it should serve as a bulwark against the socialist countries in Eastern Europe, and against the danger of the spread of socialism in Western Europe. But the most recent negotiations with Connally in Paris have revealed the sharpening trade conflict between the EEC and the lords of the dollar. 'Anti-Europe $ Bloc Urged by Connally' was the heading of the *Sunday Times Business News* on February 6, which reported:

> John Connally, President Nixon's Secretary of the Treasury, has become a passionate advocate of a dollar bloc to protect American long-range economic and financial interests against the competition of the Common Market. . . . When Connally talks about organising a challenge to the European preferential trading area, he is said to think about creating a dollar trading bloc which would include Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Latin America and Spain.

Thus every proposal for 'integration' or the formation of larger supra-national economic combinations is in fact an expression of intensified trade competition.

'European Unity'—The Big Lie

But it is not only in the economic sphere that the reality of intensified conflict of larger combinations is presented under the camouflage of 'unity'. This applies still more strongly in the political sphere. With a great fanfare of publicity the formation of the West European Common Market of the Six, with the signatures of the governments of Tory Britain and its associates to join, has been acclaimed as a 'triumph of European unity'. 'The grand design of a United Europe' became by Britain's accession, in Mr Heath's view, 'a fact':

> A Europe coming together in growing unity—historians of all nations have dismissed it as a fantasy for generations. Tomorrow sees it born as a fact. (Mr Heath's speech in Brussels on January 21, 1972, at the reception on the eve of his signing Britain's accession to the Common Market.)

There was never such a glaring misuse of language to describe the exact opposite of the truth. There are thirty-six states in Europe, or, leaving out the midgets, some thirty. The Six, even if they become the Ten, are a minority section. But it is not a mere question of numbers. It is a question of policy. The policy of so-called 'European unity' is in fact a policy for the *division* of Europe. Certainly a few ritual gestures express the hopes for good relations with the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

socialist states of Eastern Europe. But the glaring fact is obvious to the blindest that this is a bloc of the most powerful West European capitalist states, constituting an economic and political combination linked to Nato, enclosed behind tariff walls alongside the military frontiers of Nato, and counterposed to the socialist states of Eastern Europe linked in the defensive alliance of the Warsaw Pact (which was only formed after Nato, as a result of the organisation of Nato, and with repeated proposals for the dismantling of both pacts and their replacement by a European regional security pact in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations).

Strategy of the Division of Europe

The strategic aim of the West European imperialist combination, disguised under the sweet terminology of a 'United Europe' becomes obvious as soon as the expressions of its principal spokesmen and advocates turn to military questions. Mr Heath was at pains to insist in his Panorama interview on January 24 that his so-called 'Europe', meaning the sectional West European bloc, would not be 'a third force' with the 'unfortunate connotation of being a neutral', but that 'we in Europe' would be 'a force on our own which stands for the things which Europe believes are important.' It is a significant testimony to the role of the Common Market, and of the British Tory Government's policy of accession to it, as an essential part of the Western strategy for the division of Europe, that Sweden and Switzerland declined to join the Common Market precisely on the grounds that their policy of neutrality precluded their joining such a combination. The language of the Western military commanders is open in treating throughout all their calculations the Soviet Union as the enemy. This is the continuation into modern conditions of the basic Western imperialist line since 1917, which led to the advance of Hitler and the second world war; which was only temporarily interrupted by the necessities of the war alliance, but immediately after broke all the wartime agreements of Teheran and Yalta and Potsdam; forced through the division of Germany in order to rearm West German militarism against the opposition and warning of the Soviet Union; and through Nato established the system of the strategic division of Europe which is increasingly recognised by all progressive people today as a menace to the future of the peoples of Europe. It is fitting that the same Douglas-Home who was a joint artificer of the Munich betrayal should now be in charge of the Foreign Office for Britain's adherence to the Common Market. But the change in the balance in Europe

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

today, with the advancing strength of the socialist states and progressive forces of the peoples is opening the way towards new policies in order to end this strategy of the division of Europe, and to prepare an alternative future through a European Security Conference. The fight for this vital aim is now reaching its most decisive stage in 1972.

Mockery of European Revolutionary Tradition

There is no limit to the insolence of the champions of the Common Market in trying to conceal their real strategy for the division of Europe and the consolidation of the bloc of West European counter-revolution behind language proclaiming the opposite. Just as the division of Europe is described as 'European unity', so the organisation of West European counter-revolution is acclaimed as the heir of the European revolutionary tradition. For the official anthem of the 'European Economic Community', the Six and the Ten, Mr Heath and his fellow champions of Tory counter-revolution have had the effrontery to adopt Schiller's 'Ode to Joy' and Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, the glorious expression of the revolutionary awakening directly inspired by the great French revolution and proclaiming confidence in the future revolutionary victory of human brotherhood ('seid umschlungen millionen'). A different precedent was recalled to one observer by the ceremony in Brussels when Mr Heath received the £36,000 for his 'services in the cause of European unity' awarded by the Freiherr von Stein Foundation of Hamburg, set up by the West German industrialist and banker millionaire Topfer. The ceremony led a contributor in the correspondence columns of *Labour Weekly* to comment under the heading 'Rising Prices':

> Judas got 30 pieces of silver for turning Christ over to the Romans. Edward Heath got £36,000 for turning Britain over to the Europeans. Seems the price of everything has risen.

Napoleon's Warning

Long ago Napoleon gave the warning that if England aspired to become a continental power this would bring the ruin of England:

> Napoleon's dictum at St Helena that England could never become a Continental Power, and in the attempt to be so must be ruined. (Memorandum of Lord Salisbury against Lord Lansdowne's proposal for an Anglo-German Alliance, quoted in Algernon Cecil's *Lord Salisbury's Foreign Policy*.)

The British ruling class consistently sought to direct its policy to maintaining its dominant position in Europe from *outside*; to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prevent any other power becoming dominant in Europe; to maintain division in Europe; but never to become involved directly as a continental European power. In accordance with this tradition the Tory rulers of Britain took up an initial hostile attitude to the formation of the West European Common Market as representing a combination which could endanger Britain's interests. They endeavoured to form their rival alternative combination in Efta; but this proved insufficiently strong to be effective as a competitor. They tried to foster the Commonwealth combination through imperial preference; but they found themselves compelled to recognise that Australia and Canada were increasingly drawn into the orbit and influence of the United States, while India and the ex-colonial countries were moving towards independent policies. They tried to build on the 'special Anglo-American relationship', but found that, while the US rulers were ready to use Britain as a satellite, they had no use for any pretence of Britain to be an equal. Thus the Tory rulers of Britain, having been already rebuffed by de Gaulle, who then equally rebuffed the Labour Government's subsequent approach, finally saw no alternative but to buy their way into the Common Market bloc on the most expensive terms at a late stage, when its constitution and conditions had already been fixed without Britain's participation, and a vast volume of decisions and regulations had already been adopted, to which Heath had to swear allegiance. The price they had to pay as late arrivals to those already in possession involved ruinous cost to Britain, as the mass of the British people clearly recognised. But the Tory heads were ready to pay this price, despite opposition also in their own ranks, with a calculation of obtaining some advantages for some monopolist interests, and with the hope of eventually being able, through close co-operation with France, to exercise a dominant role.

Why No Referendum?

Four Governments signed accession to the Six in January: Britain, Norway, Denmark and Ireland. In every case the decision was made in face of strong and articulate popular opposition. In recognition of the momentous character of the constitutional issues involved a referendum is being held in Norway, Denmark and Ireland. But not in Britain. Why? If it is argued that a referendum is incompatible with parliamentary democracy, then it has to be explained why a referendum is compatible with parliamentary democracy in Norway, Denmark and Ireland, but not in Britain. The reason is obvious. Everyone knows that if a referendum were held in Britain

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it would result in rejection. Despite the most overwhelming lavish government publicity campaign, the good sense of the mass of the British people has recognised the ruinous costs and consequences of entry. The Government endeavours to claim the parliamentary vote of October 28 as adequate authorisation to take action on this momentous issue involving the whole future of Britain without submitting it to the electorate for a decision in a general election. So long as the old familiar hocus pocus of bi-partisan or three-party 'consensus' to cover up, as always, the most vital issues affecting the life of the people, could be claimed to be operating, as was the case until last year, this standard deception to prevent any expression of the will of the people could be successfully maintained. But the overwhelming strength of popular opposition on this issue was finally able to range the entire official labour movement, the trade unions, the Labour Party Conference, the Labour Party Executive, the Parliamentary Labour Party and the Shadow Cabinet to oppose the Government's terms for entry. Thus the issue became an issue of division between the two dominant parties of the traditional two-party system; and according to all previous standard procedure (compare the two general elections in 1910 to settle the issue of ending the veto power of the House of Lords), when so momentous an issue, affecting the whole constitution and future of the country for generations, becomes an issue of direct division between the two main parties, it has to be submitted to the electorate.

Continuing Battle

The parliamentary vote of October 28, which the Government now claims as its sufficient authorisation without need of an election, was a spurious parliamentary endorsement of entry, since it was only obtained by 69 allies of the Tories in the Labour ranks casting their votes with the Tories against democratically agreed Labour policy, and thereby, together with 20 abstainers, saving the Heath Government, which would otherwise have been defeated on October 28 by 46 votes, if all the Labour representatives had voted in accordance with official Labour policy (see these Notes of December 1971, pp. 539-40, for the figures establishing this). This spurious majority of 112 on October 28 soon sank to 21 by January 20 on the eve of the signature of accession; and Mr Heath has declared his determination to put through the legislation to complete the handing over of Britain to the Common Market by a fixed date even if he had only a parliamentary majority of one, without permitting the popular will to be expressed through consultation of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the electorate. In other words, the battle is not over. It goes forward. When Heath signed accession, the English text of the mass of documents of decisions and regulations to which he was swearing allegiance was only available to MPs two days before the signature of accession, and impossible to be mastered by any within that time, since according to the *Times* of January 20 the complete set comprises 90,000 pages, weighing 42¾lb, and costing £143. No wonder the Government has preferred a short bill of a few clauses registering acceptance, like a blind date, rather than attempt to get the vast mass of decisions and regulations, in whose drawing up Britain has had no participation, through parliament. And even for this bill's deception of a spurious ratification the guillotine is to be used. In this way every attempt is being made to put through the betrayal of Britain under a cloud of concealment and confusion. But the vigilance and strength of the popular fight, if effectively mobilised, can still defeat this attempt.

Squandering the Surplus

During the quarter of a century since the war the supreme objective presented to the British people, equally by Labour and Tory governments, as justifying every sacrifice and restriction of consumption, was to achieve a surplus on the balance of payments. During the six years of the Attlee Labour Government from 1945 to 1951 the net deficit was £1,770 million; and to meet this the reform programme gave place to the Cripps programme of austerity and the wage freeze, which finally toppled the Labour Government and brought in the Tories for thirteen years. In all the exhortations for restraint and cuts to meet the deficit no mention was made of the fact that the deficit was entirely due, not to extravagant consumption by the British people, but to the Government's overseas expenditure, mostly military, and the overseas export of capital, in the attempt to restore and rebuild the traditional imperialist basis of Britain's economy. The same experience was repeated with the Wilson Labour Government from 1964 to 1970. Once again the people were exhorted to accept sacrifices and cuts in order to convert an inherited deficit on the balance of payments, officially recorded as £745 million, in 1964, into a proudly proclaimed surplus of £800 million (adjusted in subsequent revised official calculations to £631 million) in 1970. Once again the unpopular restrictions and cuts and the battle against the trade unions resulted in the fall of the Labour Government and the return of the Tories. But the boast of the achievement of the surplus remains the principal claim

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to achievement of the Wilson Labour Government, as set out in his own memoirs. However, once the consequent Labour dissilusionment enabled the Tories to come back to power, what are the Tories preparing to do with this surplus built up by the Labour Government's imposition of restrictions on the people? Are they proposing to use it to rebuild Britain's productive economy? Not at all. They are preparing to blue the entire surplus in order to pay the costs of entering the Common Market. They refuse to give a figure of how much the heavy cost will be to the balance of payments. According to the treaty text the United Kingdom would have to pay 19 per cent or nearly one-fifth of the total budget of the EEC. But this is only part of the full costs for the balance of payments. Varying estimates have been given; many experts have calculated that the total net cost to the balance of payments would be in the neighbourhood of £800 million, and have anticipated that a new devaluation will follow. Along these lines the old treadmill would be repeated, with renewed exhortations to the people to tighten their belts in order to meet Britain's desperate economic situation, through the usual methods of restrictions, idle plant and extending unemployment in place of policies of expanding production, full employment and rising standards. Once again the economics of Bedlam.

Miners in the Vanguard

The miners' battle, now in its fifth week at the time of writing this last Note, is entering its most critical phase, with the Government opening all its guns to blast the whole economy in the endeavour to vanquish them. This battle represents beyond question, not only the most significant battle of the whole period since the Tory Government came into office, the first national strike of the miners since 1926, but the vanguard of the challenge of the whole working class to the bankrupt economics of the Tory Government and big business, the economics of idle plant and mass unemployment and soaring stock market fortunes, and the demand for alternative policies corresponding to the aims of full employment, expanding production and rising standards. By the justice of their demand, that the first claim on industry shall be to those who go through all the toil and danger to produce, and not for dead capital or parasites remote from production, the miners in this battle represent the creative force for Britain's future, just as have done the workers of UCS with their demand that the right to work shall be recognised as a universal social right. Of course the battle for these

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

principles meets with the most ferocious resistance from the Tory Government and the propertied interests. The Tory Government and embattled forces of big business manifestly determined from the outset to make the fight against the miners the decisive test of class confrontation, as they have so often done in the past, to array all their strength in this battle in order to establish the supremacy of their class power against the challenge of the militant working class. But the strength of working class militancy and solidarity, shown in support of the miners, the UCS workers and the many centres of struggle, with action on the workshop floor, organisation on the key district level, and in some honoured examples on the national level, have startled the ruling class, and revealed how much the mobilisation of the full strength of the working class could achieve. The miscalculations of the Heath Government, and the consequent reckless desperate emergency measures striking blows at the economy whose cost exceeds many times over the cost of the miners' demands, have demonstrated the bankruptcy of their policies to all. The miners have led the forefront of the working class fight for many generations. Their battle today, whatever the immediate further developments which may be reached by the time these lines are read, has once again led the way for the battle of the whole working class against the bankrupt policies of the Tory rulers of Britain; to prepare the way forward for a basically different type of policy in every field to be pursued by any future government resting on the support of the workers; and through such policies of far-reaching economic, social and political changes to prepare the conditions to win, by the combined strength of the working people, the future society in which those who produce will enjoy the fruits of their production.

R.P.D.

Does your union advertise May Day greetings in Labour Monthly?

Rates are: full page £40 half page £20 one-third page £14
quarter page £10 one-sixth page £7

Book space now—phone 01-346 5135 or
write to 134 Ballards Lane, London, N3 2PD

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNEMPLOYMENT

Richard Briginshaw
General Secretary
National Society of Operative Printers and Assistants

IT was apposite of Harold Wilson, in opening the parliamentary debate on unemployment in the House of Commons on January 24, to welcome Mr Heath back from Brussels to reality in Britain: the reality of 1,020,000 unemployed. If the Prime Minister really believes in his Common Market fantasies, so far as Britain's trade and economic prospects are concerned, he is suffering from political cretinism. He has, however, definite political and sinister objectives in pushing the UK into the European Economic Community. So has the ruling Tory establishment that he represents in producing the officially figured 1,020,000 unemployed. They purport to be shocked, but are they?

The figures for registered unemployed understate the size of the problem—and an analysis on figures alone is insufficient in getting all the aspects of the situation exposed. The figures are there, in spite of assurances given by leading politicians and the Government of the day a generation ago that full employment was in the area of historic commitment. For our capitalist rulers to fulfil *their objectives* such an undertaking was hypocritical. In the new competitive international trade situation that emerged following the second world war our rulers had to find new ways to cut wages and push up productivity—or as they put it, to cut costs to meet overseas trading competitors. A repetition of the wage-cut policies that followed the first world war could not be put through. Then, open declarations by Tory politicians 'that the wages of all workers must come down' could be made and operated with the consequent confrontations of class against class which were accepted by our rulers as an only-way calculated risk. They were in a different world context to that existing today.

They learned new tricks for application in the second post-war period. A Keynesian steady inflation was given a speed-up, to a good gallop. The effect of increasing prices was to devalue and thereby cut workers' real wages. When our people tried to catch up and offset this daylight robbery, they were offered 'new monies', tied to new productivity schemes, some involving the utilisation of new machinery and/or fresh techniques, leading to just simple job cutting, so that, to get back what had been taken by a sly banditry, we

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNEMPLOYED

By the grace of the Government—*Notenkraker*

From *Labour Monthly* of March 1922

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

embarked on one of the paths that was to lead inevitably to the present unemployment situation. Some 'productivity' schemes in various service industries were simply 'service standard' reductions: less men, worse service for the public. In return, the workers received monies to fill the gap which the robbers' inflationary tricks had created. For instance, streets which were swept each day became streets which were swept twice weekly under some new 'scheme'. Postal services were torn to shreds. Railways, in spite of some excellent inter-city advances, give overall a worse service than the late Victorians had: under-manned stations, overworked personnel, manpower overall reduced by nearly two-thirds.

What has been fundamentally different about mining in the general analysis? Manpower down from 600,000 to 265,000. The redundancy procedures were tied to onerous conditions. A job, quite different to the normal work of a redundant miner, with probably a wage-cut of 25 per cent, was offered by the Coal Board and was thirty, forty or more miles away. If the miner did not want to take the job or move, his redundancy pay and unemployment benefit could be stopped, and in many cases was. The workers' basic wages have not anywhere near kept up with the trickery of the inflation. Now the miners are bitter, and are entitled to be. The new plant which was to create efficiencies in many industries squandered them in the bigger confidence trick of the Treasury Mandarins in seeking to achieve a 'favourable balance' each year on our home and international financial and trading accounts, demanding a Stop every time there was 'five-minutes' Go.

The massive river of unemployment has been fed from many tributaries. In Printing and Paper, over a period of about 12 years, we have lost approximately 35,000 jobs. We did all stand for it a bit, did we not? We had said it would be politically impossible for mass unemployment to return. We said that a government that allowed, let alone created, mass unemployment, would be hounded from office. Well, we must certainly do that, for in the same debate in the House of Commons on unemployment, Mr Heath said:

> The plain fact with which this country and the House are faced is that we are securing today the same production—in fact, slightly more—as two years ago, using 400,000 men fewer to do it.

The other aspect has been the consciously encouraged 'shake out' process by which the Tories had anticipated that mass unemployment would take the guts out of the wage struggle of the workers. Some of their spokesmen deny, and others confirm, that this is a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conscious policy. The fact is that the process of staff reduction is so widespread that a conscious central policy indication is certain.

Barber says workers have priced themselves out of jobs. The fact is we have politically under-priced ourselves out of jobs: our failure to make fundamental changes in our society in 1945 and 1964 has done this. Our support for phoney prices and incomes policies that aim at wage freezes have all added to our problems: prices control, yes; wages are always controlled while there is a capitalist dominance in our society. So we can and should reject any further wage-freeze projects. We need higher wages. We need expansion in the economy. We need new political and social interventions in our national affairs. These necessities cannot come from a Tory Government. In the meantime, we must demand action on investment of our money into our industries. This is a clear link with a clear demand for more nationalisation—this to reflect people's power in participation *and* control at all levels.

A few months ago TUC leaders told Mr Heath, in direct confrontation on the unemployment situation, that they had forecast as long ago as February 1971 that a million workpeople would be unemployed by Christmas, and had continually emphasised that this figure would be reached unless there was a change of policy. There was a need for a rate of economic growth of 6 per cent in order to make a significant impact on the unemployment figures, though even this will still leave 750,000 unemployed at that time the following year. This, TUC leaders went on, would require an injection of around £1,000 million into the economy. A crisis of confidence was affecting manufacturers. Even though there was adequate liquidity in the economy and funds available for investment, businessmen were still not investing. The CBI survey of investment intentions showed that no increase in investment was expected in 1972 over the low level in 1971. The rate of economic growth over the next year on present policies would be well under the 4 per cent figure suggested by the Chancellor in his July statement.

Three hundred and fifty million working days in unemployment have been lost since the Tories stole into power. Unemployment, the waste of manpower and resources, the degradations for human beings, alongside a Tory Government in 1972, are anachronisms. Both must go!

Full time students will be interested in the special concession on *Labour Monthly* subscription rates. See inside back cover for details and subscription form.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TRADE UNIONS AND THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS ACT

Christopher Norwood*

NO reasonable person can expect that one can improve industrial relations by an act of law. The difficulty faced by the trade union movement in Britain today is that it was their own party, the party they pay for, which introduced the first direct attacking legislation against the trade union movement since before the second world war. The action of the Labour Government in attempting to introduce its forms of industrial relations law not only led in part to its own defeat but also set the disastrous precedent from which the Conservatives have moved.

Their legislation is now law, and it will be a fact to be taken into account in all negotiations with which the trade unions are involved. There is no point in pretending that it is not law. Given this fact, there are two questions which follow: (1) How far and in what industries the employers are going to attempt to make use of its provisions; (2) The way in which the movement will react to the legislation. I will deal with these two separately.

Some employers (probably covering a very large number of union members) will behave as if the legislation did not exist at all. Where an employer is faced with a strongly organised and traditional group of trade unionists who have the benefit of determined leadership, it will not pay him or her to use the various punitive provisions of the Act. We have recently had a good deal of comment about the liability of unions for damages as a result of industrial action. Some people, in my opinion wrongly, believe that a registered union (because of the limitation on damages to

* Christopher Norwood is a Divisional Councillor of the Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers. He was for some time a Member of Parliament (for Norwich South). He has been for many years Chairman of the North West London Branch of his union, prior to which he was a member of the National Union of Mineworkers, working in the Maypole pit.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

£100,000 in each case) is better off than one that is unregistered or de-registered. In fact, in a well organised situation there is no point in an employer attempting to bankrupt a union, for the very simple reason that with an effective union, the employer has an organised means, whether official or not, of bargaining. With a bankrupt, non-existent union with no officials, he must negotiate with chaos. Furthermore the employer must weigh in his mind the possibility of creating such a situation if he takes legal action against the unions.

Thus, in my opinion, the employers who are likely to use the provisions of the Act by taking legal action will be those who know that their workers are partly organised, badly divided by inter-union feuds, or where the union membership is captive because it suits the employer to maintain a condition of employment knowing that he has a weak union to deal with. Without blaming the various unions concerned, instances must occur to readers.

Another problem concerns the employers' attitude to individuals who are full time or lay officials in their union. The Act would seem to indicate that any official of an unregistered union can be held liable by the court for unlimited damages. I have heard this fact quoted in conversation by some active trade union members as a compelling argument for registration.

Yet it would be a most appallingly dangerous sanction for an employer to use. The consequences of laying a massive claim for damages against a respected trade union official in a well-organised industry beggar description. His people would automatically support him in the only way that is possible, i.e., by industrial action. Further, few, if any, trade union officials could be described as wealthy men, and for all practical purposes the debt could never be collected although the harm its imposition might do would live on for a generation. It would be possible for the employer to use this sanction only in the case where the officials concerned were not supported by their members. It may be that the Government's draughtsmen believed that this is a common situation in major disputes and that workers are intimidated into going on strike in large numbers. In point of fact, as the reader will know, and as any competent personnel department knows, the reverse is usually the case.

The classic instance of this is well known in the movement and was, of course, referred to in the evidence in the Donovan Commission. The reading of the details of the wartime dispute in the Kent pits and of the thousands of never-to-be-collected fines would be

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hilarious did it not contain such an important message about the meaning of solidarity. That message is not likely to be lost on the personnel departments of industries such as mining, the railways, the docks and transport generally, or in the engineering industry.

On the second question, that of trade union reaction, this has condensed around the seven part proposition carried at the Croydon Special TUC in March 1971, together with the further resolution instructing the General Council to support all unions in their fight against the legislation and to instruct affiliated unions not to register and to take measures (if necessary) to remove themselves from the Provisional Register.

To some extent this is a compromise situation, but even so there are unions which are seeking to disregard it, apparently because they believe it to be in the short term interest of their organisation to maintain itself as an organisation. In some cases the unions concerned would appear to be worried by the possibility of the loss of groups of captive membership. In other cases the explanation is of discrimination between registered and unregistered unions under the various taxation laws. With the exception of Equity, I do not find any of these arguments convincing since they disregard the fact that to be effective the trade union movement must be an entity. The fear that some employers will be unwise enough to promote 'house' unions under the provisions of the Act and to seek recognition for them as bargaining agents is a real one; what I think these unions neglect is that, in the likely event of their losing their affiliation to the TUC, they are no longer protected by the Bridlington Agreement from the loss of those of their members who really know what trade unionism means to a genuine trade union. The people concerned might have to remain as nominal members of the half 'union', but their real allegiances would lie elsewhere. It is just these people who, by their active work and the time they give up, really sustain any union or any part of the movement.

In conclusion, the likely development appears to be that unions who refuse to de-register will cease to be part of the movement proper. I do not believe that there will be many of the major and traditional trade unions who will take this course. For the individual concerned in this situation there would seem to be only one course of action, to use his or her best endeavours to make sure that their union is de-registered and in the event of their efforts being unsuccessful to make sure that they become a member of a union which has remained part of the movement that the Labour Government and its Conservative successors set out to destroy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HONOUR TO EMILE BURNS (April 1889-February 1972)

The range of achievement of Emile Burns throughout his long life of tireless creative activity right up to his final illness was so manifold that no tribute can do justice to his record.

Rightly the main tribute from all quarters has been to his foremost role as a Marxist scholar. Generations of English-speaking Marxists have learned their Marxism from him and been formed and moulded by his teaching. In his classic translations of *Anti-Dühring* or from the *Theories of Surplus Value* he was able to combine his theoretical mastery with his command of simple and lucid English style. His *Handbook of Marxism* remains still the best introduction for new readers to begin to make acquaintance with Marxism through its skilful choice of extracts.

But his scholarship was never separate from the most active political life. The genius of his personality in close contact with industrial workers was brilliantly shown in his assistance in the organisation of the busmen's rank-and-file movement in the thirties, with his editorship of the *Busman's Punch*. From his earlier days in the Independent Labour Party, and throughout the existence of the Communist Party, he was in the forefront of activity, equally in the national leadership and at the local branch level, in charge of press and publicity, as tutor, propagandist and fertile publicist. His publications of books and pamphlets would fill pages merely to list. He played an active role in many organisations, notably the Labour Research Department, and was at all times a valued contributor to *Labour Monthly*.

It may be hoped that readers will forgive a note of warm personal memory. The three of us, Elinor, Emile and I, worked together already before the foundation of the Communist Party. When he was Secretary of the ILP Information Department, and I was Secretary of the International Section of the LRD, we co-operated in 1919 to produce the publication *Trade Unions in Soviet Russia*. With Saklatvala we jointly organised the campaign of the left in the ILP for communism against MacDonald in 1920, followed by the entry of the left into the Communist Party in January 1921. From this co-operation I learned to admire the mastery of methods of organisation both of Emile Burns and Elinor, and through many years of association have always found inspiration in their example and in the privilege and pleasure of their comradeship.

A few of Emile Burns's contributions to *Labour Monthly* include: *The Independent Labour Party Programme* (1926), *Are We Nearing Revolution?* (1926), *The Outlook for British Capitalism* (1927), *Labour and the Banks* (1928), *Rationalisation and British Industry* (1928), *Class Against Class on May Day* (1932), *The Causes of Crisis* (1939), *Full Employment* (1944), *Tory Wage Policy in Ruins* (1962), *Why the Stagnation in Britain's Economy?* (1966). **R.P.D.**

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CAN WE AFFORD THE PROFIT MOTIVE?

Harry Smith*

TWO quotations are the starting-point for this article: they come from an article by Samuel Brittan in the *Financial Times* of January 13, 1972. The first is his basic premise and the second his conclusion—Britain is now an underdeveloped country of sorts, and the unions are responsible for this and for consequential unemployment:

> . . . the UK is now exhibiting some of the symptoms of a high-level underdeveloped country . . . [this] depends on the definition of the capacity ceiling—for much of what looks like spare capacity may in fact be technologically obsolete or badly adapted to market requirements.

> The threat to employment . . . arises from the success of trade unions in pushing up . . . real wages . . . and depressing both the share of profit and the rate of return on capital.

Brittan's view has been echoed by Messrs Campbell-Adamson and Jukes, respectively directors-general of the Confederation of British Industries and the Engineering Employers' Federation. Edward Heath and other Ministers have recently dutifully repeated the theme. Brittan's argument is naturally attractive to them. It should not fool us for one minute. Take the phrase 'what looks like spare capacity may in fact be technologically obsolete or badly adapted to market requirements.' What does it really mean? Surely that capitalism has failed to keep wide areas of manufacturing industry technologically up-to-date. The present slump in world capitalism and resulting sharper competition then ruthlessly exposes that the products of these areas are no longer competitive. And so unemployment and closures.

Brittan's first quote contains a strong implication that 'technologically obsolete or badly adapted' industry must be closed down. When he uses the phrase 'underdeveloped country', this is just what Britain will be if we follow his ideas. To what a pass we have come when this is the stock-in-trade of ideas of a modern apologist of

---

* Harry Smith, who writes here in his personal capacity, is Editor of *Tass Journal*, for the Technical and Supervisory Section of the AUEW.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capitalism. What price free private enterprise? What value the profit motive, that sure engine of all progress?

What areas of industry are we talking about? Certainly shipbuilding, machine tools, aircraft, textiles, railways and steel. The story of shipbuilding since the war is a disgrace. The year 1946 saw British shipbuilding in an absolutely dominating position in the world. The short-term profit-milking which went on year after year, whilst the yards decayed relatively and absolutely, is the process which is responsible for the present state of the industry, for the closures, for the unemployment, for all the resulting social ills. With variations of circumstance and detail the same is true of each other named industry.

The problem goes even deeper. To an extent all of British industry shows the same phenomenon, recently given point in global figures of investment being quoted as much below those of Britain's main capitalist rivals.

How does it happen that Britain, the first nation-state to develop modern machine industry, now finds its industry, to greater or less degree, in such a state? What has caused Britain to decline from its original status of 'workshop of the world' into the second world economic league? Is it the fault of the workers? We say no! It is clearly the fault of those who owned and controlled the system from its inception. The capitalist class.

The factors which have already laid waste much of industry and weakened much more are the incessant sucking out of profit from industry at the expense of technological development; the export of capital in great quantities in recent time; and the colossal allocation of resources to military purposes. To deal briefly with the last point, speaking in the House of Commons on January 24, 1972, Mr Heath declared:

> Large areas [of industry] required . . . modernisation . . . Europe . . . did it after the war. . . . We still need to do it . . . on a massive scale.

Well, Edward, what would an injection of £2,700 million per year, diverted from military spending, do to revitalise key sections of industry? The small change alone would completely resolve the UCS problem. Of course, Messrs Brittan, Campbell-Adamson and Jukes have jobs which require them to defend capitalism in their various ways. They would argue that making profit and exporting capital are very laudable activities. 'Society' echoes this view. Are not the honours lists loaded with the names of successful profit-makers and capital exporters?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Distributed profit, as opposed to the surplus derived from economic activity, is that which is taken away from industry. Capital exports are profit extracted from industry, then removed from the nation whose industry created it. Even since the war the capitalist class have continued the process of sucking a gigantic river of profit and exported profit from the industries or factories whose activity created them.

Put another way, workers work their guts out in backward industry. Capitalism sucks away so vigorously that industry falls into a further stage of decay, whilst the rich continue to heap up wealth and build superb technologically equipped factories in places like South Africa, Rhodesia and Spain. They manage to describe the process as some form of patriotic endeavour. It is the exact opposite.

At this stage of the process, Brittan and company put forward the idea that wages should be held down to a level which will permit 'technologically obsolete or badly adapted industry' to survive. Presumably, the owners of such industries will then continue to cause decline, and workers will have to accept less and less. Fortunately, workers are most unlikely to follow the example of the donkey in the folk story, who just got used to living on nothing when he died.

The alternative, Brittan and company threaten, is to close such areas of industry and become a novel type of 'underdeveloped country'. What a prospect! He is really suggesting throwing away a number of basic industries and having an incredibly high pool of unemployed, as a permanent feature of society. The underlying bankruptcy of ideas of the more influential capitalist ideologists and spokesmen reflects the growing bankruptcy of their system in Britain, that profit-making no longer provides the spur to cause capitalism to expand economically. Their ideas decline with their system.

Workers will reject the sleight-of-hand type of argument which starts with the idea of blaming anyone except the real culprits, and seeks to make workers the whipping-boys of their dilemma. We can accept Brittan's picture of the decay and decline of the system. Our conclusion must be that it is time to replace it, if the workers of Britain are to live full and happy lives in an economically expanding system of society. In the meantime, defend our industries. Oppose closures and redundancy. The instincts of the advanced workers are sound, even if their immediate operations are limited. Above all else, work to bring down this Government before it gets any further along the road of making Britain a 'high-level underdeveloped country'.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN IREL

D. Lloyd George, Prime Minister from 1916 to 1922, fulminated against the Irish struggle for liberation: 'There is intimidation, there is murder, there is treachery—murder, cowardly murder—cowardly mean murder. . . . The police regard these people as part of the citizenship which they are prepared to defend, and when the policeman passes on he is shot in the back. And while the police are discharging these elementary duties of civilisation. . . .' These words were published alongside this cartoon by Will Hope when it first appeared in the *Communist* of February 26, 1921.

Lloyd George's Liberal Chief Secretary for Ireland, Sir Harmar Greenwood, was politically responsible for the repression. J. H. Thomas, General Secretary of the National Union of Railwaymen, was already regarded as a traitor to the labour movement: seven weeks later on Black Friday (April 15, 1921) he was to betray the miners in their struggle. The army uniform, in which the three politicians are portrayed, is Hope's reference to the Black-and-Tans, the notorious auxiliary forces then employed in the war against the Irish.

R. PAGE ARNOT

Greenwood (to Lloyd George and Tho

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

D—THEN

Ah, the—! She's trying to strangle me!'

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IRELAND

Betty Sinclair

IN face of the events of 'Bloody Sunday' in Derry the reaction has been such as to unite practically the whole Irish nation against British imperialism. After half-a-century of division, created by the Lloyd George Government in 1920, the result was to be seen in a *de facto* united Ireland in rain- and wind-swept Derry on Tuesday, February 2, when the 13 victims of the British paratroops were laid to rest. Instead of turning the anti-Unionists of the North from their struggle to win democratic rights with which to determine their own future, the punitive attack only succeeded in rousing the whole of the Irish people in the 26 counties, from Donegal to Cork and Waterford. The Civil Rights march, which preceded the meeting, was illegal. All who participated, some 15,000, knew and understood this. They were willing to accept the punishment: a six months mandatory sentence under the Public Order Act.

The swift reaction of the whole of the Irish people in the 26 counties broke through the veneer of 'good relations' between the Lynch and Heath Governments, a few short weeks after their joint signing of the Treaty of Accession in Brussels, and indicating their determination, together, to join the European Economic Community. Lynch was forced to take action. The Irish Ambassador was withdrawn from London. The Minister for External Affairs, Dr Hillery, was sent to the United Nations to consult with the Secretary General and to secure the help of all friendly nations to end the actions of British troops in Ireland and promote a political solution. Dr Hillery was forced to use much stronger language in New York than he had done when he went there in 1969, following the August pogrom in Belfast. At a press conference in New York, he stated: 'I believe the British Government has gone mad.' He accused that Government of waging war on a population, and 'treating *its own citizens* as one would treat an enemy with which one was at war' (February 2, 1972).

The British Government reacted by defending the actions of their troops. One would expect no less when one knows that the troops were acting under orders from that Government to save their puppet regime in Northern Ireland, and its head, Brian Faulkner. Heath, since June 1970 when he became Tory Prime Minister, has acceded to all Faulkner's demands for more repressive measures, physical and legal. Heath and Faulkner have become the men of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'physical force'. They want a military solution, and do not care how many British soldiers or Northern Irish men and women fall in the accomplishment of that foul aim. It is no accident that, since August 1969, 233 persons have been killed, including personnel of the British Army, the Royal Ulster Constabulary and Reserve, and the ordinary civilian population. It is no accident that the law which has been used to validate most of these deaths is the Special Powers Act. The sad history is that the above total of dead is one more than the number who died in Northern Ireland in 1922, when the Special Powers Act was passed 'to restore law and order and give the new Parliament of Northern Ireland an opportunity to function in conditions of stability.' Needless to say, the new Parliament has never been very stable: the Special Powers Act became a permanent law and is the law which the British troops are acting under to arrest, detain, intern, carry out punitive house searches, use CS gas and water cannon, rubber bullets, and now the real thing—called for by many ultra-Unionists—lead bullets. The anti-Unionist forces, in their early months, called for British justice and British democratic rights. Now they have both, in the centuries-old British style of coercion, in that part of Ireland which remains within the orbit of British imperialism.

The British Government, in the clamour which followed the killings, decided to set up a Tribunal of Inquiry. The people of Derry and the whole of Ireland asked for an international tribunal. Maudling announced that he would set up a one-man tribunal, and named Lord Chief Justice Widgery, a man who has seen service in the British Army, who ended up as a Brigadier and was also connected, after the war, with the Territorial Army. The people of Derry and public representatives have already made it known that they will not participate in such an inquiry, composed of a single British representative, long associated with British military forces, and part of the establishment and a Privy Councillor to boot.

These suspicions have been reinforced by the statements made by the Lords Balniel and Carrington, which have already exonerated the British paratroops, and which were calculated to arouse the whole of the British people against the anti-Unionist forces in Northern Ireland. Conor Brady, a correspondent of the *Irish Times* in London, took a survey of London opinion after the Derry killings. One woman, about 40, a bank employee, is reported as saying: 'I don't understand what the Irish are all about. Do you? I think the RAF should bomb Dublin a bit and that would sort out Lynch and his IRA friends. The Army are there to stop the Irish

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from shooting each other. If the Army were shot at first then they acted perfectly legally' (February 2, 1972). The old imperial spirit dies hard, and it is this that Heath and the Conservative Government depend upon to allow them to carry out their reactionary policies and actions against the anti-Unionist forces in Northern Ireland.

Heath and Co are using the genuine affection that the British people have for the men in the Army, and their personal love for members of their families who are part of the armed forces. But the British people will have to learn that Heath and Co are not one whit concerned how many soldiers lose their lives in defence of Conservative-Unionist interests.

The British press (with a few honourable exceptions, including the *Morning Star*) has adopted the attitude of 'our Army right or wrong—but right.' Leading, as always, is the *Daily Telegraph*, which has not read any history since the days of Palmerston, and certainly not since the second world war: for the *Telegraph*, the Heath Government cannot be bloody enough. Following up, in the usual way with its 'liberal' opinion, is the *Guardian* and its writer Harold Jackson. Jackson and the *Guardian*, in the first days of campaigning for civil rights, always sought to report the actions of left-wing adventurists in Northern Ireland, whose main contributions to the struggle were to split and divide the forces and help the growth of sectarianism. Now Jackson tells us that, if there had been no march in Derry on January 30, 13 people would have been alive today. 'No-one,' he writes, 'could say that there were not enough warnings that the . . . parade would end in trouble' (January 2, 1972). As well tell the British people that they were wrong to fight Hitler fascism; if they had not done so, then lives would not have been lost.

The anti-Unionist forces in Northern Ireland face a most reactionary regime, upheld by laws that would disgrace any democratic country, by armed forces equipped with all that is necessary for the conduct of a war against a hated enemy, and which has attempted to deprive them of all forms of democratic expression. In the process, it has made prisoners of the 'million Protestants' they threaten the British Government with, if that Government does not 'make the croppies lie down'.

Mr Harold Wilson and his right-wing Shadow Cabinet have called for a 'united Ireland solution'. But, in the meantime, they have refused to 'judge the actions of the troops' until the inquiry is held and brings forth its report. Wilson has demanded that res-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ponsibility for security be taken out of the hands of Stormont and transferred to Westminster. Are there any such foolish people who believe that British armed forces, some 15,000-strong, have been allowed to come under the jurisdiction of Stormont? Both Wilson and Callaghan know that when the extra troops came in, in August 1969, they were controlled by the Wilson Government; in fact the GOC was put in complete charge of all security forces, both British and Northern Irish. Is it to be assumed that Heath, Carrington and Balniel have not retained that control? No government, much less a British Tory Government, would ever dream of allowing its armed forces to be controlled by any other government, and especially not the rump government at Stormont.

Wilson has refused to realise that, since the new situation which has arisen since 'Bloody Sunday' in Derry, the anti-Unionist forces will not accept 'protection' from Westminster. They realise that the long-threatened 'Protestant backlash' has found its reality in the backlash from Downing Street and Stormont Castle—with the British armed forces playing the main role. Much has been said about the 'restraint practised' by the Unionist forces. Why should they not be 'restrained', when they have a well-armed force to do their dirty work?

As one writes all eyes are on the town of Newry in Co Down, where a Civil Rights march is planned for Sunday, February 6. Dire warnings have been issued about the consequences if the march takes place; all people are called upon by Stormont to 'respect the law', and are informed that the law 'will be maintained and enforced'. But the demand is going up to continue the struggle for democratic rights, for the withdrawal of the paratroops, the pulling out of the military from anti-Unionist areas, and subsequently the complete withdrawal of all armed forces. The forces of progress want the repeal of the Special Powers Act and the passing of a Bill of Rights for Northern Ireland at Westminster. They have called for the release of the internees and political prisoners, a guarantee of rights for all political groups to work peacefully for the attainment of their political objectives, the extension of the British Race Relations Act to cover Northern Ireland, and a guarantee of fairer electoral systems under proportional representation.

The demands emanating from the North are being matched by the developing campaign in the South. Peace and normal political conditions will not come to the Irish people, Catholic and Protestant, until the country is united, and until British imperialism's writ is completely expelled from the country. The detestation of that writ

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brought down Lord Nelson's statue from its pillar in O'Connell Street in Dublin in 1966, when Ireland commemorated the Golden Jubilee of 1916. That writ was also responsible for the burning down of the British Embassy in Dublin on February 2, by over 25,000 determined workers and students of that city. Oppression never brings friendship or gratitude. When that oppression is applied to the people of another country, their righteous anger is indeed formidable.

The Unionists of the North, in their locked and barred Parliament at Stormont, see the writing on the wall, and are coming together to maintain their right to keep the Irish people divided for another half-century. Faulkner, after a 'tough' speech, got his first cheer from the Unionist garrison—Paisleyites and all. They misjudge the history and the times. They misjudge the strength of the wrath of an outraged people. And they are prepared, as has been often threatened, to bring the whole of Northern Ireland down in chaos, before they submit. To help prevent such a calamity will be a major task of the British people. They must, in a way they have never done before, press their Government to see that justice is done at long last. Otherwise, they, the British people, will become accomplices of reaction and will have set the scene for the destruction of their own democratic rights (already the miners are tasting a little of 'British justice' in their struggle for higher wages), which will leave them helpless before the present onslaught of Tory reaction.

The Irish people will fight on. They know now what they face. They will never forget 'Bloody Sunday', and will never forgive those responsible. Someday, in the near future, there will come to their aid new pens of the calibre of Sean O'Casey and J. M. Synge, who will write of that awful carnage, and of the words of the mother of Michael Kelly who strove to get near the coffin of her son as he was taken on his last journey from the church of St Mary's on top of Creggan Hill, overlooking the Bogside: 'Let me see you again. I love you Michael. Don't take him from me. I want to see him buried.' All Ireland has mourned. But all Ireland will some day rejoice.

Labour Monthly Bound Volumes

Our price list is available on enquiry

Have you ordered your volume for 1971 at the reduced price? See outside back cover

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Southern Africa

SOUTH AFRICAN CONGRESS OF TRADE UNIONS

John Gaetsewe
Representative in Britain
South African Congress of Trade Unions

THIS month is the seventeenth anniversary of the South African Congress of Trade Unions. It was formed on March 5, 1955, in Johannesburg, South Africa, started with a few affiliated trade unions consisting mainly of Africans, and by 1965 it had 53 affiliated trade unions with a membership of 55,000.

The aims of the South African Congress of Trade Unions were to serve the interests of all workers, irrespective of race, colour or creed. These aims were confirmed by the first conference held in Cape Town in 1956. The majority of the affiliated trade unions of SACTU were African; this was not due to any discriminatory policy on the part of SACTU, but to the fact that it is the African worker who is not covered by any recognised trade union federation and has no negotiating machinery in any industry in South Africa. This is so despite the fact that African workers comprise about 70 per cent of the total labour force.

For their opposition to apartheid and discrimination, the leadership and activists of SACTU and its affiliated trade unions were arbitrarily arrested, banned and removed from their trade union offices by restrictions and police intimidation of the workers. Some sympathetic employers, who allowed the workers to hold meetings in their premises, and some landlords who allowed African trade unionists to have offices in their premises, were threatened by the police with refusal to renew their licenses. Some of the trade union leadership still labour under house arrest, others serve life imprisonment, and others are in exile.

The more the economy of South Africa has developed, the more new laws have been enacted to restrict the African workers and to deny them the same rights which white workers in South Africa enjoy. After the general strike of 1922 the South African Government made a new law allowing all other workers to form recognised trade unions: the Industrial Conciliation Act of 1924. This includes a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clause which recognises workers under the definition 'employees'. Only those workers who were *not* pass-bearers were covered by this definition 'employees'. They had the right to organise, to join a trade union of their choice, to form trade unions and negotiate with the employers on behalf of their members. Because African males were pass-bearers, they were automatically excluded by this definition of 'employees'.

Despite this repression, a number of trade unions from 1928 onward were formed: the Clothing Workers' Union, the African Laundry Workers' Union, the African Bakers' Union and, in 1937, the African Engineering Workers' Union. These unions did have offices in the industrial areas and had round-table discussions with the employers and negotiated for their members. They were strong, militant trade unions. In most cases they negotiated from strength. This of course the Government did not like.

After the second world war, the second new wave of industrial development came about. Again many Africans, as they returned from the war, joined the few others who were already in the labour field in South Africa. They spread into many cities and industrial areas. Here again new legislation, known as the Abolition of Passes and Co-ordination of Documents Act of 1952, was passed, imposing further restrictions on the movements of African men and women.

Here one can mention but few of the laws which were introduced: the Industrial Conciliation Act of 1956, one clause of which was on job reservation. This Act was more vicious than the first Industrial Conciliation Act because it separated the trade unions on racial lines. Even sympathetic unions would not, after this Act was passed, accept the functioning of the African trade unionists in their offices. Since African trade unions are not recognised as such, they cannot register under the Industrial Conciliation Act of 1956. 'Job reservation' reserves certain jobs for whites only. The Native Settlement of Disputes Act, denies the African workers the right to take part in any form of strike, carrying with it a fine of £500 or three years in jail for an African worker who participates in a strike. The Suppression of Communism Act of 1950 in fact regards anyone who opposes apartheid as a Communist. Many African trade unionists had already been removed from their trade union offices under this Act.

Discrimination in employment also grew as the economy expanded. In 1893 the Transvaal Volksraad enacted a law prohibiting the Africans, Asians, and Coloureds from performing blasting operations—a major occupation in mining. In 1896 and 1897 further

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

laws were passed reserving other mining jobs (work done by banksmen, onsetters and winding-engine drivers) for qualified whites only. When the British annexed the Transvaal in 1902 these laws were retained, and after Union in 1910 the statutory colour bar in mining was embodied in the Mines and Works Act of 1911, which empowered the Governor-General to make regulations for the issue of certificates of competency in skilled occupations in mining and engineering. Under these regulations, non-whites in the Transvaal and Orange Free State could not be granted certificates.

In 1923 the courts declared the regulations *ultra vires* but in 1926 a new 'Pact' government (Labour Party-Nationalist Party alliance) amended the law to reverse the court decision and restore the colour bar. Thereafter, certificates for engine driving, blasting, surveying and other skilled occupations in the mines were again denied to Africans (see *South African Workers under Apartheid* by Alex Hepple). To this Act the Nationalists added a second in 1951, on the building industry. The Bantu Building Works Act of 1951 prohibited the Africans from doing skilled building work in white areas.

White workers are now being recruited from Europe to come and work and settle in southern Africa. These workers are allowed to bring their families, with the aim of settling in any part of southern Africa, but Africans who are being recruited from the rural areas in South Africa and also from Mozambique, Malawi, Botswana, Lesotho all come as migratory labourers, having to remain on a temporary basis, without their families.

British and other European workers who refuse to go and work in South Africa do so not only on the grounds that they will be taking away jobs that belong by right to the Africans; they are also refusing to go and settle in South Africa and bolster up apartheid and discriminatory policies whose aims and purpose are to put the Africans under perpetual domination. This solidarity on the part of the British workers is highly appreciated by our people who see the stand taken by the national unions, trades councils and the TUC on their opposition to the sale of arms to South Africa, on the boycott of South African sport, the boycott of South African goods, and the campaign to stop emigration to South Africa.

Here I can mention only a few national unions. The National Union of Mineworkers continues to campaign against the emigration of mineworkers to South Africa. The Miners' International Federation has appealed to all its affiliates to express their opposition to the recruitment of European workers to work in South Africa.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Attempts were also made to recruit bus drivers from this country by the Johannesburg City Council; this was strongly condemned by the Transport and General Workers' Union in London and by the International Transport Workers' Federation, which also has its office in London. The Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers Technical and Supervisory Section (at that time DATA), at their National Annual Conference in May last year, carried overwhelmingly a strongly-worded composite motion which included a clause instructing the Executive to support any worker who refused to work on arms contracts. In May and June last year South Africa made another attempt to recruit workers from a broad range of jobs in the printing industry. The unions concerned in this country urged members not to accept such positions.

The campaign on arms, emigration and investments received a tremendous boost from the decision taken at the 1971 TUC Conference. Motions submitted by the Musicians' Union, Chemical Workers' Union and Tobacco Workers' Union, with an amendment by DATA, were included in a strongly-worded composite motion which Congress adopted unanimously. The motion included opposition to the sale of arms to South Africa, support for workers who black arms, a call for the withdrawal of all union investments in firms with South African interests and, also a decision to give moral and material support to the liberation movements who are struggling against apartheid and discrimination, and the breaking of trade union links with white-only trade unions in South Africa.

We are aware that the battle is in South Africa and it is the African workers who must themselves struggle for the achievement of democratic rights in their own country. While this is so, it is important to realise that Vorster gets political, military and economic support from the supporters of apartheid in Britain. The African people will win, but before they win their struggle they need friends indeed, to whom they will say, after they have achieved their freedom: 'During our struggle you stood at our side.' This will undoubtedly create bonds of friendship between the workers of this country and those workers who are struggling for their rights in the southern part of Africa.

PASS IT ON . . .

When you've finished reading this copy of *Labour Monthly*, why not pass it on to a friend or workmate?

You might gain us a new reader—especially if you point out the generous post free subscription offer inside the back cover.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Southern Africa

THE AFRICAN PEOPLE SAY 'NO!'

Alan Brooks

SIR Alec Douglas Home and Ian Smith tried very hard to leave Rhodesia's five million Africans out of their 'settlement' scheme. No black man was party to the lengthy negotiations which led up to the constitutional formula adopted. Virtually no black man stands to gain any personal advantage from the implementation of the proposals, and the African people in general will be much worse off if the settlement goes through. No genuine consultation of African opinion (e.g. by referendum, after open debate with the African nationalist parties freely participating) was wanted by Smith and Home, and none is being allowed to take place, as the whole world has seen from the shooting of dozens of Africans, the arrest of hundreds, and the restrictions upon the activities of the African National Council, all of which has been happening under the nose of the now utterly discredited Pearce Commission.

Yet the African people refused to be left out. They grasped the meagre opportunity offered by the release of some (by no means all) leaders, took the test of acceptability at its face value and in a great upsurge of united opposition cried out an uncompromising, unmistakable 'NO!' to the designs of British imperialism.

Meanwhile, some thousand miles to the west, an equally militant, determined, and profoundly significant struggle was being waged by the people of Namibia (South West Africa), in particular by the Ovambo workers. In December for the first time in the history of the country, and for the first time under the apartheid regime since the 1961 stay-at-home in South Africa, a massive general strike was launched against Vorster's hated rule. The immediate cause of this heroic achievement was the contract labour system which kept the men of Ovamboland as a sub-proletariat—forced to sell their labour by their landlessness and rural poverty, and to sell it to a single agent of the employers, the South West Africa Native Labour Association, which with government backing maintained a system of convict-type forced labour. Wages of £10-£12 a month, 12-18 month separation of men from their families, and appalling working conditions were the price the workers paid for the super-exploitation

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of their labour. They had—and still have—no trade union rights or political rights whatsoever.

The deeper cause of the Namibian strike, which both generalised it beyond the ranks of the Ovambo workers (who form 70 per cent of the labour force) and escalated it quickly from an industrial struggle to a broad political struggle, was the continued domination of Namibia by the South African regime in defiance of local and world opinion and international law. The strike paralysed the country, and lasted over six weeks. It exposed the falsity of the Vorster regime's claims, embarrassed it internationally, demonstrated the political maturity of the Namibian people and inspired millions of oppressed people throughout southern Africa. It hardly needs to be added that both these massive 'NOES'—to the Home-Smith betrayal and the South African domination of Namibia—took place in the face of vastly superior force and naked repression. There were marginal limitations on the authorities in both cases: the need for Ian Smith to appear to comply with the vague requirement of 'normal political activities', and the South African Government's concern to establish the legitimacy of its annexation of South West Africa before the bar of world opinion, especially since last summer's adverse ruling of the World Court at the Hague. Both limitations were soon overridden by the more basic desire of both regimes to preserve white supremacy at all costs. Thus the Smith regime has killed and imprisoned far more people since the beginning of December than in the whole of the preceeding eighteen months, and most released detainees are back behind bars. And in northern Namibia the South African army moved in at the end of January, clerical critics were silenced and the press totally excluded, while on the other side of the border, in Angola, Portuguese troops were deployed to terrorise the local people. (The Ovambos live on both sides of the border.) Latest reports indicate that, although some strikers have gone back, many are staying out, and the struggle has turned into an armed uprising in the northern bush.

Meanwhile on the eastern flank of southern Africa's battleground, in the Tete province of Mozambique, FRELIMO harassment of the Cabora Bassa project has been stepped up significantly, while last year's attempts by the Portuguese army to crush the liberation movement in the two northern provinces have been decisively defeated*. And in the heartland of white supremacy, South Africa,

* For an excellent, detailed account of the dangerous Cabora Bassa Dam project see *Cabora Bassa and the Struggle for Southern Africa*, World Council of Churches, 40 pp., 15p.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

popular resistance to apartheid—symbolised by the brave Indian school-teacher Ahmed Timol, who was murdered by the security police in October—has been welling up more widely and openly in recent months than at any time in the past eight years.

Illumined by these beacons of anti-imperialist struggle, the Heath government stands nakedly exposed, its policies threadbare and disastrous. Even if the Pearce Commission returns with a dishonest unbelievable 'Yes'—a possibility by no means to be ruled out—the Anglo-Rhodesian deal will largely have failed. The failure can be made complete if the British labour movement matches the clamorous 'NO' of the African peoples with its own united 'NO'. *No* to the Cabora Bassa Dam, *No* to Heath's alliance with the Vorster regime, and *No* to the impending abandonment of sanctions against Rhodesia and recognition of the illegal Smith regime. When the Conservative Government came to power, it launched itself into the sale of arms to Vorster only to be shocked, checked and all but blocked by the pressure of Commonwealth and domestic progressive opinion. As a result, arms for apartheid is a policy which has had to be virtually shelved for the past year. Today the same widespread mobilisation of the labour movement is demanded by the squalid Rhodesia betrayal.

LABOUR MONTHLY FIFTY YEARS AGO

It is as dangerous to base a policy solely on the conditions of the present depression as on the abnormal opportunities of the war period and the years immediately following it. Action must, of course, be modified in the light of changing conditions; but we have now the materials on which to base a policy taking account both of depression and of inflation in trade, both of abnormal unemployment and of actual labour shortage.

Such a policy, it seems to me, must in nowise leave out of account the prospect of considerable 'pre-revolutionary' gains, or of important encroachments on the capitalist control of industry in advance of the actual overthrow of the capitalist system. Certainly, as long as capitalism maintains its ultimate power in society, these advances can only be limited and, in a sense, negative; and certainly no mere accumulation of them can carry with it the change from capitalism to workers' control. They are not the capture of the citadel of capitalism, but the occupation of outposts in its territory, valuable to some extent in themselves, but more as affording both a means of hampering the operations of the enemy, and a favourable base for more decisive operations.

(From 'A Word to the Engineers', by G. D. H. Cole, *Labour Monthly*, March 1922)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS (1)

Academician E. K. Fedorov*

THE public at large in different countries is nowadays displaying a growing concern for the man-nature relationships. Many scientists, public figures and politicians have made statements and written numerous books and articles on the issue. Many meetings of scientists have already been called to study environmental problems and, as is known, the United Nations is holding a special conference on ecological problems in 1972.

The main problems that are very much on everybody's mind are the adequacy of natural resources for meeting the needs of the rapidly growing population of the Earth, the effect human activities have upon our natural surroundings and, in particular, their contamination and pollution.

The adequacy of natural resources is known to have assumed a social and political meaning since the days of Malthus. His followers assert that the final resources of our planet, in view of the unlimited growth of mankind's needs, will not only present a limit to the development of society in the future but even now are the basic reason for the low living standards in the developing countries, where population growth is not accompanied by appropriate economic development rates.

I do not intend to enter here into any polemics on the issue, but I would like to state that in reality the entire history of mankind bears out the view that the possibliltes of meeting the needs of humanity in the past were, in principle, always ahead of the growth of its wants. At the present time the relation still holds good and is true and valid. The contention is true, of course, only if we take the needs of human society as a whole and consider the totality of the resources available for their satisfaction on the entire planet.

We can refer to a number of examples to prove the point. The amount of energy that can be at the present time potentially generated per capita of the Earth's inhabitants by the use of the known resources and methods of their utilisation is approximately twenty times larger than that which could be produced a hundred years ago

* Professor Fedorov is a Soviet geophysicist and astronomer. Born in 1910, he was educated at Leningrad University. He worked on the Arctic seaboard of the USSR and, in 1937-38, took part in 'North Pole I', the first drifting icefloe station, for which he was awarded the title of 'Hero of the Soviet Union'. He joined the Communist Party in 1938. Since 1955 he has been Director of the Institute of Applied Geophysics, Moscow. We publish here his address to the World Peace Council in January.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the resources and by the methods available at the time.

If modern agricultural techniques, implemented in a number of countries at the present time, were applied in all the fields and plantations of the globe, we could meet the needs for food not only of the present generation of the world, but produce foodstuffs in excess of our needs. The so-called 'green revolution' now in progress in many countries is a convincing proof of the correctness of this evaluation.

The explored resources of mineral wealth keep on growing both in their absolute value and in their share per capita of the population; at the same time the possibilities of producing any materials we need from many kinds of available raw-materials are likewise growing.

We are, naturally enough, aware of the fact that the needs of the bulk of the globe's population are so far not met and fall short of the existing possibilities. We know that people are starving in many countries. But in no way is this a result of some natural law of the scarcity of natural resources. This situation has been produced for clear-cut social and economic reasons. In the developing countries, in particular, retarded economic growth is rooted in age-long colonial exploitation when the natural wealth of these countries, and their manpower resources, were used for the enrichment of the colonisers. Thus, both in the past and in the present, the total volume of the planet's natural resources has in no way adversely affected the progress of mankind.

This state, however, cannot last forever. The ultimate size and mass of the Earth, regardless of the efficiency of the use of the mineral resources it carries, can present a certain limit to the optimal size of the globe's population. The definition of the limit and of the time when it will present itself in practical terms can hardly be defined in our days. The capacity of our planet is a variable that is always increasing and is dependent upon the methods of using the Earth's space and its mineral resources. The value, however, cannot grow infinitely. So, in the future, control of the globe's population may become a necessity. Whether such control will be necessary to prevent the population from growing, or, on the contrary, from decreasing will become clear in the future. A certain optimum size of the Earth's population in no way implies the necessity of limiting the entire population. It is possible that by the time the need arises man will be capable of building large orbital outer space stations, or using other celestial bodies for human habitation.

All this in no way implies that the economical use and conservation of natural resources actually present no problems for us. We run up against them long before the depletion or exhaustion of natural

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resources begin to hamper further social progress. The potential supply of the globe's natural resources can be realised in practical terms only when and if natural wealth is utilised in an optimal way in its totality. The optimal use of these resources is obstructed by serious adverse factors.

Thus, private ownership of natural resources and of the means of their exploitation very often results not only in a non-optimal, but a rapacious, use of minerals and other wealth of the Earth, especially through the activities of foreign companies, as so often is the case in the economically dependent countries. Then the monopolies are very often responsible for the artificial boosting of consumers' needs and the resulting waste of natural resources. A serious drag on the rational use of natural resources in the economically underdeveloped countries, whereof the population constitutes the greater part of mankind, is inadequate production means and lack of skilled manpower. The use of many natural resources, such as fish, or mineral wealth from the subsoil of the ocean-floor, has now assumed global proportions, transgressing the limits of individual countries. At the same time, there is so far no international machinery whatsoever that can ensure a rational and optimal use of these resources in the interests of mankind as a whole.

These and many other circumstances are obstructing the optimal use of the total wealth of our planet. The same factors, even more widely, obstruct cultivation of natural resources. Cultivation presents itself as a problem mainly in relation to restorable natural wealth, such as fresh water, the living resources of the continents and of the seas, forests, soils, the oxygen of the atmosphere, etc. These resources are characterised not only by a common physical volume but by a permanently restorable balance—the ratio between diminution, or consumption, and restoration due to biological, or other natural processes.

At the present time we consume almost all kinds of restorable natural resources, and the degree to which they are used is approaching at increasing pace the full size of their increment on the credit side of the balance sheet. Thus, we use up almost 70 per cent of the soil fit for cultivation under modern agricultural techniques, about half of the increment of the forest tree-stands, about one-tenth of the fresh water discharged by rivers, a small part of the increase of the living resources of the seas but an essential part—about 70 per cent of the increase in the industrial fish population.

The demand for restorable resources on the part of humanity is constantly growing. We learn to exhaust them more and more

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

efficiently, and before long we shall use up all the natural balance. Then, as in the case of the whaling industry, for instance, a limit has to be drawn or a break-even point reached between the increase and the consumption of the resource in question, or we shall have to start cultivating natural resources and, consequently, change their natural balance. Such cultivation started a long time ago when men gave up hunting and the gathering of wild plants as the main means of sustaining life, and began cattle-breeding and land tillage, thereby increasing manifold the productivity of these resources, a process that has continued ever since.

We are already effecting the redistribution of our water resources on a regional basis to meet the demand for water in the most thickly populated areas, shifting huge masses considerable distances, and we reclaim and improve large areas of land by cultivation and afforestation. At the present juncture, society as a whole faces the necessity of huge cultivation programmes that would encompass the entire world. Modern scientific and technological achievements make it possible to start pilot programmes with these aims in view.

However, it is well known that social and political conditions have, so far, made such actions practically impossible. Moreover, it is now impossible to define the expediency and emergency of this or that specific cultivation programme from the view-point of mankind.

Man's activities in the use of restorable natural resources affect our environment on an ever growing scale. By removing some of the substances from the natural cycles, and by introducing therein additional substances (mainly pollutants caused by industrial wastes discharged into air or water), we change the very composition of the environment, or, to be more precise, disturb its natural balance resulting from the natural circulation of various substances. Pollution and contamination are mainly responsible for the changes in these natural balances. Pollution of our natural surroundings is justly viewed as one of the greatest challenges to humanity.

The greatest danger arises from the contamination of continental lakes, rivers and water reservoirs. Though an ever-growing number of industrial enterprises have now adequate purification instalations, the basic method of reducing polluting effects is the dilution of industrial wastes by pure water. This practice absorbs an increasing share of river discharges. If no drastic measures are taken to remedy the situation, in some 50-70 years from now such industrial diluting practices will require not less than half the total discharge of the rivers of the globe.

Water pollution is no longer an internal matter of this or that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country. Wherever a river flows through several countries it becomes not just an international, but a global problem as the greater part of the high seas and oceans have, in no small way, already been polluted by man-made products. The situation in the atmosphere is very similar. The discharge into the air of smoke in addition to various chemical compounds is assuming disastrous proportions. Such are the conditions in numerous cities of the United States, Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany and other countries. Rapidly growing industrial pollution presents a serious health hazard.

However, pollution should and can be completely eliminated. Science and technology have already all the answers to how to do it.

(*The second part of this article will appear next month*—Ed. *LM.*)

THAT'LL TEACH 'EM!

Roger Woddis

THE ancient and honourable sport of turning back the clock has its practitioners in many fields, notably that of education. And none shows more promise than Dr Rhodes Boyson, headmaster of Highbury Grove Comprehensive School. Dr Boyson is a well-known face on those television chat-programmes which dispose of vital social problems in ten minutes flat. He is nothing if not forthright, and he lost no chances in airing his views at the first conference, held at Cambridge in January, of the so-called Council for the Preservation of Educational Standards.

Dr Boyson has no time for 'wreckers and egalitarians', i.e. those who have the temerity to question the nature of our society and go on about the need for change in the educational structure. He also grieves over the campaign to abolish all examinations.

'Historians may come to look back on the 11-plus IQ tests as a lost Merrie England for the bright working class boys' (reported in the *Daily Telegraph*, January 3). Robert Blatchford, thou shouldst be living at this hour. The trouble with bright working class boys is that they often veer towards socialism, which, I'm sure, is not what Dr Boyson wholly favours.

Dr Boyson also has an ingenious idea for giving parents vouchers (£100 a year per child in primary schools, and £200 in secondary schools). These vouchers could then be used to buy places in schools which attracted them—especially private schools. Alternatively,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no doubt, boaters could be issued to boys wishing to go to Harrow. Anything to halt the march of that horrid egalitarianism.

One way of stopping it is the creation of special schools for 'a super-elite of 2 per cent' (*Times*, January 3). Much the same sort of thought is expressed by T. E. B. Howarth, High Master of St Paul's School. If Winston Churchill, Ernest Bevin or Lord Nuffield had been sent to large comprehensive schools, 'we should now be an insignificant *gau* in the thousand-year Reich and very far from being a classless society.' You don't have to prove this statement, you just have to make it. And if a lot of ignorant bellyachers query whether we indeed have a classless society, that only goes to show how inferior they are to Mr Howarth in educational accomplishment.

The Cambridge conference heard some profound words from Professor Max Beloff, Gladstone Professor of Government and Public Administration at Oxford. With a title like that, you must be somebody worth listening to.

He criticised vice-chancellors of universities 'for giving the National Union of Students a dignity and importance for which it was by nature unfitted' (*Times*, January 4). As is well known, the NUS is *by nature* a wild, savage beast wholly lacking in those qualities of dignity and importance which sit so comfortably on the brow of Professor Beloff.

Dr Boyson swung into action again in the *Swinton Journal*, published by the Swinton Conservative College, Masham, Yorkshire. In an article, quoted by the *Times* of January 18, he advocated 'that all people should be forced to insure privately for health, pensions and unavoidable disasters.' And among those disasters, presumably, would be the awful risk of finding oneself in the same lift as Dr Boyson.

He followed this up with an article in the *Daily Telegraph* of January 21, in which, among other things, he took a swipe at Sir Alec Clegg for suggesting that indoor water closets were essential in schools. Thundered Dr Boyson: 'The great working-class cultural movements of the nineteenth century blossoming into the Workers' Educational Association came from homes with minimal sanitation'.

Down with WCs! Dr Boyson, as everybody knows, uses an earth closet, and what is good enough for Dr B should be good enough for you. In the same article he quoted, with approval, from a lecture given by a Professor Barzun at the Cambridge conference:

'He believed that teachers were employed to teach, not to look around for bad social conditions.'

Professor Barzun is a member of the United States Council for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Basic Education. Well, we all know that social conditions in the States aren't all they should be, so perhaps there's some excuse for American teachers having hang-ups about them, but that doesn't apply in Britain, surely. Teachers here who 'look around' for bad conditions are patently just out to make trouble.

'Complete equality of opportunity will never be achieved. . . .' (Pay attention, children, Dr Boyson can foretell the future). Another pearl of wisdom: 'Man is not the centre of everything.' Then who or what is? Find out by asking your parents or visiting your local library, and bring your answers to school next Monday.

Anthony Barber gets a pat on the back for being 'truly radical as the Chancellor of the Exchequer in reforming our national tax system and in cutting taxes.' (Hands up the boy who said, 'Corporation'!) 'We need equally radical thinking at the Department of Education and Science now.' (Dibley, write out a hundred times, 'I must not say God forbid'!)

Dr Boyson has a lot to say, one way and another, about 'culture and learning', 'educational standards' and 'parental choice'. But behind it all lies the sound Tory idea of teaching children the three Rs, plus anything else they might need if they are to serve the system efficiently—and above all, without looking at it too closely.

Dr Rhodes Boyson bears an appropriate Christian, if that is the word, name. His spiritual counterparts in Salisbury practise pretty much the same game as he does.

It is called Keeping the Natives in Their Place.

BOOKS

Law, Class and Society: Book Two. The Apparatus of the Law and Book Three. Law and Politics, and Law in the Colonies

D. N. Pritt

Lawrence & Wishart, 128 pp., £2, and 152 pp., £2

ON THE TITLE PAGE of each of the three books so far published in this series appears an apt quotation. In Book Two the quotation is from Goldsmith—'Laws grind the poor, and rich men rule the Law.' Those words are no less apt in Britain today than they were when written more than 200 years ago. Magna Carta ordained: 'To no one will we sell, to no one will we refuse or delay, right or justice.' Fine words. Yet some 700 years later it was possible for a High Court judge to say that 'in England, justice is open to everyone—like the Ritz Hotel.'

The author, in his own words, 'worked happily, if stormily, for half a century' as a practising barrister. Because of his active involvement, during almost the whole of that period,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in political cases, he is in an unrivalled position to look at how the law 'has grown and developed—and at how it has been used as a weapon of class struggle.'

Book Two deals with the origins and development of English law, and with the judges, magistrates and lawyers who administer and operate it. It explains clearly and simply, and with a wealth of illustrative detail, how the legal system which we have today has evolved, the purposes which it is designed to serve, how it achieves those purposes, and how also from time to time it is made to deviate from them.

The author expresses the view that 'our formless Constitution is part of the arsenal of the class war, and its very flexibility . . . aids the ruling class in its cunning exercise of power.' He proceeds to illustrate this, and further illustrations appear in Part One of Book Three. For example, the law of conspiracy is described as lending itself well to the work of using the criminal law as a weapon against the working class. In recent months we have seen this law increasingly invoked. Readers with long memories will also no doubt recall that when, shortly after the last war, the Communist Party played a leading part in squatting in blocks of empty flats, the charge brought (and sustained at the Old Bailey) was conspiracy to trespass.

In the chapter on political law, the author mentions the earliest act of parliament which can be classified as political, namely the 1367 Act of Edward III. This Act (so ancient that even part of the text is uncertain) is used from time to time when no actual offence has been committed, e.g. against Tom Mann in 1932. Of this Act the author thinks it possible it may be repealed in the near future. This reviewer has his doubts, and recalls that, despite the existence of a Statute Law Revision Committee and of a Law Commission, and several Labour governments, the Act is still in force.

Part Two of Book Three is on law in the colonies. The different colonial constitutions are discussed and explained in relation to the type of colony to be governed thereby. There is an interesting account of the recruitment of lawyers from Britain to man the colonial legal service—mainly from the 'drop-outs' of the English Bar. As for democracy in colonial constitutions, consider the example of Hong Kong, which the author points out has not and never has had any elected members to its Legislative Council. They are all official and nominated members!

These books are eminently readable, interesting, informative and enlightening, to the lawyer as well as to the layman.

W. SEDLEY

The Unholy Hymnal

Edited by Albert E. Kahn

Wolfe, 160 pp., 75p

A COLLECTION of single-sentence quotations from the top brass, civil and military, of both Republican and Democrat Parties and other 'choirboys of the credibility gap', set lying cheek by jowl with the actual facts as recorded in US. There are three main subjects: lies about Indo-China, about the big-business-Pentagon tie-up, and about student dissent at home, each section being headed by words of well-known hymns, to underline the hypocrisy of US 'government by misrepresentation'. Some equally politically motivated British author could collect an Ancient and Modern on the same lines.

A.T.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mathematical Models of the Economy and other essays
Richard Stone
Chapman & Hall, 336 pp., £5

Soviet Planning Today
Michael Ellman
Cambridge University Press, 220 pp., £1.40 (paper)

TWO BOOKS, two social systems. In capitalist and socialist countries, mathematics and computers are at the centre of an upheaval in attitudes about economic theories and practice. The computers are the same, and so—pretty well—are the mathematics: so much so that some see capitalism and socialism 'converging' on the same computer-dominated future.

Richard Stone's book is a collection of nineteen of his essays into the problems of analysing and forecasting economic growth, foreign trade, employment, demand for various goods, national income and so on, mainly with respect to the British economy. Michael Ellman's book analyses the discussion in the Soviet Union about the use of mathematical methods for solving 'optimally' (i.e. in the best possible way) the problems of socialist production. Neither book is written in order explicitly to compare capitalism and socialism (and both are written for the specialist, not the general reader). But the differences between the systems are highlighted by the differences in the application of these apparently similar mathematical processes.

The first difference lies in what is the *whole aim of production*? Prices, profits, interest, are all words which may be quite properly used in both capitalist and socialist economies—but their meaning is quite different, and the definitions of 'success' and 'failure' are irrevocably distinct.

The second difference is *who benefits*? Class power does not affect the answer to the sum two plus eight equals ten, but it does determine who gets the two, who gets the eight. The computers in a society with working class state power are doing a different job from those where there is capitalist class state power.

The third difference is in *how far is a solution possible*? Capitalism has certain laws or tendencies, and it is therefore possible to identify and measure these, as Stone and others do. But then what? A society where the means of production are privately owned and controlled is one where even the 'neutral' government of a liberal fantasy cannot do more than 'influence' the economy. Capitalist economies may be compared with a huge half-filled badly made barrage-balloon rolling downhill. If you prod one side, it is certain that a bulge will appear somewhere else. But where? And when? And (most important) will it happen in the same way the next time you prod? But the control *possible* over a socialist economy is quite different. As Ellman notes, 'Soviet specialists on optimal planning consider that a necessary condition for the efficient allocation of resources is the social ownership of the means of production.' Exactly!

What about the politics of all this? Much of the discussion has centred on what is seen as the 'implications for democracy', and it is clear there must be many, although on the question of what sort there is much disagreement. Some see computers as being, in the long run, the means by which a highly centralised economy can be more efficiently organised than human minds, unaided, can accomplish. Others see computers as being the source of a great *decentralising* movement. Each of these estimates is seen as 'good' or 'bad' depending on whether socialist democracy is thought to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

depend on economic decentralisation or not.

The point is that the type of control offered by the new mathematical techniques and machines—to a social system that can use them—can be judged, not as political institutions, but in the same way as the hammer, the wheel, or the steam engine have been judged, as the tools with which man affects his environment. They are part of the *basis* of a society, shaping its whole political and social structure, not the superficial temporary factors to be hitched to one or other viewpoint in any short-term argument —however important—between one political tendency and another.

PHIL GOODWIN

Marx and Keynes: The Limits of the Mixed Economy

Paul Mattick

Merlin Press, 364 pp., £2.50

THIS BOOK will have a certain vogue among readers who have already written off both the theoretical analyses and the practical importance of the world communist movement (including Lenin). Outside the inexperienced (who are fortunately acquiring a greater realism) and the arrogant (who are not), it is hard to share the publisher's view that the book will 'come to be recognised as an authoritative challenge to orthodox economic theories.' Its 23 chapters are repetitive and only loosely related to its subtitle. They were admittedly written at various times (from internal evidence mostly before 1965), and show little signs of later co-ordination. This would matter less if it were not that both the Keynesianism examined as well as the critique of it have an old-fashioned quality (the latter perhaps the somewhat dogmatic Marxism of German Social-Democracy in the 1920s?). The employment of 'state capitalism' in place of Lenin's state-monopoly capitalism makes for confusion rather than clarity. Finally, while all constructive thinking about socialist economies is to be welcomed, their introduction as 'so-called socialist economies', and the analysis of their production relations in terms of 'the nationalisation of capital as capital', is but a variant on a theme that is as unilluminating as it is familiar.

R. BELLAMY

Up With All That's Down!

Angela Tuckett

The Quill Press, Swindon, 100 pp., 45p

THIS IS A HISTORY of Swindon Trades Council, from its foundation in 1891 to the present year, told on the basis of extensive research, and with lively detail which will speak to the heart of everyone who has worked in or with local working class organisations. But it is more than that too. Written by a consistent Marxist and active organiser herself—well known to readers of *Labour Monthly*—it manages to give, through the prism of one important local body, a brief picture, at every stage, of the struggles and problems of British labour as a whole over these 80 years: the proper setting for such a history. Swindon has not been a national storm-centre of the working class: Angela Tuckett faithfully records the weaknesses as well as the achievements of its trade unionists. But their record in the fight for trade union rights in the 1900s, in tackling the practical problems raised for the workers in the first world war, at the time of the general strike of 1926, and during the war of 1939-45 makes good reading. It should suggest much that could be done locally by trade unionists and others with initiative and socialist outlook, at this present time of doubt, not to say disgust, in 1972.

ANDREW ROTHSTEIN

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ALTERNATIVE PRESS

THEY say we have a government in Britain today—that crowd that would like to be treated as the 'guv'ners', and no questions asked. And now blundering ineptitude has become their *public* face, scarcely veiling their harsh, selfish grasping: they can't run our country, and they shouldn't be allowed to do further damage pretending they can help anyone but themselves.

Hearing the BBC play down the results of Disruption Day in Northern Ireland, and knowing immediately that this line must be the one 'arrived at' (if not deliberately contrived by collusion) by the guv'ners of the press, we looked forward all the more to the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association's own estimate given in *our* daily press, the *Morning Star*.

Betty Sinclair's article in this issue of *LM* was written before D-Day, and even before the great Newry march, but this doesn't prevent her look at the situation on the eve of Newry from achieving that perspective for which *LM*'s pages are sought by so many who follow the daily events closely. A reader put it to us recently: 'I order *LM* every month from our local bookshop, after it was recommended to me by a subscriber, and although I receive many periodicals I find *LM* the clearest Marxist analysis of world events, past and present.'

This need for the journal is matched by its need for readers in an ever-widening circle. Our present readers are the ones best qualified to bring *LM* to the attention of new readers whenever and wherever they can.

Nicola Seyd

£86.28

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: L. Bates, 25p; Blackburn Branch, 15p; Oldham Branch, 10p; Mr and Mrs Guinan, 25p; E. Strachan-Rogers, £1.05; Mr and Mrs J. Kokos (+ extra 35p for Xmas), 60p; J. W. R. Clark, £3; Len Potter, £1; 'Oliver Twist', 50p; Marie Philibert, 25p; M. Morgan, 25p; P. W. Ladkin, 50p; J.D. (Canada), £2; R.F.B., £9; E. Sheldon, £1; Ben Ainley, 50p; H. Brindle, 60p; Len and Stella Perkins, 25p; A. Corbett, £1; R. Paul, 50p; 'Pax', 25p; L'Humanité, 30p; Southend Branch, £1; T. Crichton, £1.50; J. Purton, 37p; B.R. (USA), £2.26; 'Socialist Sailor', £2; W. Laithwaite, £5; 'Scarlet Ribbons', £5; J. Tarver, £1; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme), 5p.

OTHER DONATIONS include: H. F. List, £1.30; Dr J. Lipetz, £2.30; L. Green, 60p; A. Bush, £2.60; M. Brandt, 10p; J. H. Wood, 60p; Mr and Mrs P. Feltham, 60p; H. Eldridge, £1; J. J. Christie, 60p; W. Rees, £1; R. Garrett, 30p; J. Redfern, 60p; P. Lindsay, 60p; L. Congreve, £1.60; H. L. Cooper, 60p; B. Lovell, £1; P. Epstein, 50p; Mrs B. Ireland, 60p; J. Fraser, £1.10; W. Charles, £1.10; D. McCallum, 60p; J. S. D. Bacon, £1.60; R. A. Ward, 50p; H. Rosen, 60p; G. Callicott, £7.60; C.T.M. (Watford), 50p; 'Two Old Timers', £1.50; G. Nott, 80p; B. S. Marsh, 10p; J. Laird, 60p; W. Rickeard, £1; H. R. Sandison, 10p; D. A. Hamilton, £2.10; Mrs Albert, £1.60; Mrs A. Ross, 60p; F. Lister, £1.10; Union of Turkish Progressives in Britain, £1; D. I. P. Rees, 60p; 'R.B.', £1; H. L. Phillips, 60p; J. Allenby, £1; C. Dutt, £1.

Our thanks to you all. 134 Ballards Lane, London, N3 2PD (01-346 5135)

Bankers' orders to: National Westminster Bank Ltd., Finchley Central Branch A/c No. 37564838, Code No. 60-08-20.

Published by Unity Publications (Finchley), Ltd., and printed by London Caledonian Press Ltd. (T.U.), Watford, Herts.—54723

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POST FREE SUBSCRIPTION OFFER

for Labour Monthly, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N3 2PD

Home and Overseas (unsealed) 1 year £2.40, 6 months £1.20

USA

1 year $7.00 (sealed $10.00)
6 months $3.50

Canada

1 year $7.50 (sealed $8.50)
6 months $3.75

Air Mail rates quoted on application

Please start my subscription from the ..... issue

Name.....

Address.....

.....

Special Student's Concession

1 year £2.20
6 months £1.10

I am a bona fide student at

.....

Please start my subscription from the ..... issue

Name.....

Address.....

.....

.....

Please make cheques, etc. payable to Unity Publications (Finchley) Ltd.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

The Tolpuddle Martyrs, Joyce Marlow. André Deutsch, 320 pp., £3.50.

A Short History of Soviet Society, Lelchuk and others. Progress Publishers (Central Books), 444 pp., 90p.

Socialism and Capitalism: Score and Prospects. Progress Publishers (Central Books), 288 pp., 75p.

Soviet Armenia, A. A. Aslanyan and others. Progress Publishers (Central Books), 256 pp., £1.

Two Hundred Days of Fire. Progress Publishers (Central Books), 294 pp., 90p.

Fifty Fighting Years: The South African Communist Party 1921-1971, A. Lerumo. Inkululeko Publications, 216 pp., £1.25.

Multinational Corporations and British Labour, John Gennard. British-North American Research Association, 53 pp., 80p.

Cabora Bassa and the Struggle for Southern Africa. World Council of Churches, 40 pp., 15p.

THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST

Marxist-Leninist quarterly journal of the African revolution published by the South African Communist Party

Post free 15p per copy, 60p per year, from

INKULULEKO PUBLICATIONS, 39 GOODGE STREET, LONDON W1

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PLACE YOUR ORDER NOW!

Labour Monthly 1971 Bound Volume

Price £2.90 post free, or send £1.30 and your loose copies as soon as possible to:

UNITY PUBLICATIONS (FINCHLEY) LTD
134 BALLARDS LANE
LONDON, N3 2PD

LABOUR RESEARCH

DRUG INDUSTRY
WOMEN AT WORK
TRADE UNIONS AND REGISTRATION

15p, or 17½p by post, monthly
£2.10 per annum

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
78 Blackfriars Road, London, SE1 8HF

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(25p a line, minimum 90p. Cash with order to: Unity Publications (Finchley) Ltd, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N3 2PD.)

SOCIALIST LIBRARIES & pamphlets bought. 01-876 7254. Hammersmith Books, Liffords Pl., S.W.13.

LABOUR—CP—TU—LEFT books and pamphlets wanted. Good prices. Wants list available. **Katanka Books,** 103 Stanmore Hill, Stanmore, Middx.

WANTED—to increase stocks for bound volumes—any loose copies of *LM* for 1921-36, Mar-Aug 1939, 1940-41, Dec 1942, 1943, Feb & Oct 1944, Jul & Aug 1945, 1946-48, Jul & Sep 1949, 1954, Dec 1957, Jun 1958, Dec 1959, 1962, May 1963, 1964, Feb & Nov 1966, Jul 1967 and Dec 1969. **Particularly wanted are Mar & Aug 1922, Oct 1927 and Mar 1932.** We are grateful for any of these sent to: 134 Ballards Lane, London, N3 2PD.

MIMETTE FURS LTD.

Wide range of furs, coats, stoles and capes

117 High Street, Croydon, Surrey
'Phone 01-688 4328

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED